## History of the Law

In June 2004, the California Attorney General's Office and two environmental groups filed a lawsuit under <a href="Proposition 65">Proposition 65</a> against several major retailers for selling jewelry containing dangerous amounts of lead without providing the required wording. The lawsuit resulted in a <a href="Consent judgment">Consent judgment</a> with a number of jewelry manufacturers, distributors, and retailers. The settlement requires these businesses to comply with restrictions on lead in jewelry.



Shortly after the original parties settled the lawsuit, the California legislature enacted the Lead Containing Jewelry Law (<u>Assembly Bill 1681</u>, Pavley, Stats. 2006, c. 415). The law codifies the standards that are in the consent judgment. In 2008, the Legislature amended the Lead Containing Jewelry Law (<u>Assembly Bill 2901</u>, Brownley, Stats. 2008, c. 575). Among other things, AB 2901 amended the definition of jewelry, extended the restrictions to promotional items, required manufacturers to provide compliance certifications, and enhanced DTSC's enforcement authority.

In 2010, California's legislature again modified the law, now called the Metal-Containing Jewelry Law, to include a restriction on cadmium in children's jewelry, effective January 1, 2012. Senate Bill 929 (Pavley, Stats. 2010, c. 313) restricts cadmium in children's jewelry to 0.03 percent or 300 parts per million. Please go to our Cadmium in Jewelry web site for more information.

